



Case No. 1:12-CV-00758  
Gwin, J.

628 F.3d 790, 791 (6th Cir. 2010).

Moreover, the fact that all parties jointly seek a protective order or propose a confidentiality agreement does not overcome the general rule against sealing cases and documents. *See Proctor & Gamble Co., 78 F.3d at 227* (warning district courts against “abdicat[ing their] responsibility to oversee the discovery process and to determine whether filings should be made available to the public” and against “turn[ing] this function over to the parties,” which would be “a violation not only of Rule 26(c) but of the principles so painstakingly discussed in *Brown & Williamson*”).

A successful protective order motion must show specifically that disclosure of particular information would cause serious competitive or financial harm. *See, e.g., Brown & Williamson, 710 F.2d at 1179-80.* Here, the movants fail to meet this standard. The proposed confidentiality agreement is exceedingly broad and unspecific. The movants ask for blanket authority to designate documents as confidential that they mark as “Confidential.” [Doc.21.] However, they have failed to show that public disclosure of any information might cause serious harm or is otherwise warranted.

This Court will not grant the parties blanket authorization to cloak the entire case under a veil and **DENIES** the proposed stipulated protective order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 31, 2012

s/ James S. Gwin  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE